

Remarks

Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the remarks that follow.

In the October 7, 2004, Office Action, the Examiner required new drawings. Enclosed herewith is a single sheet of new formal drawings that are intended to replace the informal drawings filed with the original application documents.

The Examiner objected to claim 9, requiring that "an scanning" be replaced by --a scanning-- in line 1. As indicated above, claim 9 has been cancelled.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the Usami '988 patent. Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Usami '988 patent. Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Usami '988 patent in view of the Hane '764 European patent. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Usami '988 patent in view of the Boies et al. '732 patent.

As indicated above, claims 1-10 have been cancelled. New independent claims 11, 12 and 13 have been added. For the reasons set forth below, it is believed that new claims 11-13 patentably distinguish over the references cited by the Examiner, whether considered individually or in combination.

More specifically, the invention defined in each of Applicant's claims 11, 12 and 13 is directed to a computer-controlled image capturing system that, in its normal operation, captures a live video image of the display object. A remote computer terminal is connected to the imaging device to receive imaging data from the imaging device relating to the display object. The remote computer terminal also transmits control signals to the imaging device. As indicated in Applicant's specification in the discussion of the related art, in conventional computer-control image capturing systems, the image data is either a live video image as captured by the imaging device or a single static still image. In accordance with the present invention, video data compensating a range operation parameter values is gleaned from the live video image captured by

the image device and display simultaneously through the remote terminal. The user then selects a preferred display image, which results in the parameter value range being updated to reflect the operating parameter value associated with the selected display image. A new range of parameter values is then generated and transmitted an updated control signals transmitted to the imaging device to cause the capture of a new set of data images. This process iteratively continues until a final image is selected, a final parameter control signal based upon the final selected image is transmitted to the imaging device, and a final live video image is generated using the operating parameter control value is associated with the selected final image. New independent claim 11 recites the simultaneously display images as being still images; new independent method claim 12 defines the display as being a video motion loop; and new independent claim 13 recites the display image as being a sequence of still images.

The primary reference cited by the Examiner, i.e. the Usami '988 patent, discloses the utilization of an initial still image, which is then scanned or copy into a computer database, as the basis for generating a plurality of display still images. As in Applicant's claimed invention, the still images are iteratively updated based upon the selection process, until a final still image is selected.

However, unlike the claim 11 method, the still images are not generated from a live video image, nor are control signals iteratively transmitted to an image-capturing device to provide the iteratively updated still images.

In greater contrast, the claim 11 method displays video motion loops; the claim 11 method displays still image sequences.


Thus, Applicant submits that the methods defined by new claims 11, 12 and 13 are neither taught nor suggested by the Usami reference, whether it is considered individually or in combination with one or more of the Hane '764 European patent, or the Boies et al '732 patent.

For the reasons forth above, Applicant is of the good faith belief that all claims currently pending in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Therefore, it is requested that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: February 7, 2005

By: 
Michael J. Pollock
Reg. No. 29,098

Attorneys for Applicant(s)